DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 205 SP 041 005

AUTHOR	Huang, Sandra; Yi, Yun; Haycock, Kati
TITLE	Interpret With Caution: The First State Title II Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation.
INSTITUTION	Education Trust West, Oakland, CA.
PUB DATE	2002-06-00
NOTE	24p.
AVAILABLE FROM	The Education Trust, Tel: 510-465-6444; Web site: http://www.edtrust.org/main/main/index.asp.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; Accountability; Data Collection; *Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Program Evaluation; State Government; Teacher Certification; Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Higher Education Act Title II; Waivers

ABSTRACT

In enacting new teacher quality provisions in the Higher Education Act, Congress intended to increase clarity and consistency of public reporting about the status of teacher education programs and ensure that states establish accountability measures for teacher preparation institutions. Beginning in 2001, states must report yearly data on six dimensions of teacher preparation and performance (teacher standards, requirements for certification/licensure, assessment requirements and pass rates, criteria for measuring program performance, teachers on waivers, and state efforts to improve teacher quality). This paper presents results from an analysis of this data, investigating whether states are meeting the requirements and spirit of the law. Overall, state reports revealed little. Most of the reporting was inconsistent, incomplete, and incomprehensible. Some of the misleading findings include the fact that only one teacher preparation institution in the nation is classified as low-performing. A very low number of teachers are on waivers, and many institutions, even whole states, have 100-percent pass rates on licensure tests. Some states still have very weak assessment systems or no teacher assessment system at all. Many states have very large differences in the distribution of uncertified teachers between high-poverty districts and others. Study data are appended. (Contains 15 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 468 205

SP

Interpret With Caution:

The First State Title II Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation

June 2002

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Education Trust

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. Barth
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Sandra Huang, Yun Yi and Kati Haycock

SP 031 005

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The status of teacher preparation

The standards movement challenges American teachers as never before. It asks them to get all of their students to levels that used to be achieved by only a few.

Teachers themselves worry about whether they are prepared for this challenge. The American Federation of Teachers issued a blistering report on this subject in 2000, calling for far greater involvement of arts and sciences faculty in the preparation of teachers and for the adoption of more rigorous content tests for licensure. Teacher educators involved with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future addressed a looming national crisis in one of the major reports to emerge during 1990s. They warned, "Student learning in this country will improve only when we focus our efforts on improving teaching."

Voters worry too. In the most recent Public Education Network/Education Week national public opinion poll, they rate improving teacher quality as number one on their agenda. And business leaders have joined the call; putting a qualified teacher in every classroom is a high-priority issue for the National Alliance of Business and the Business Roundtable.

The data suggest these folks are right to be worried:

- Nationally, approximately one in three new teachers lacks full certification (U.S. Department of Education, 1999).
- Nationally, nearly one in five secondary classrooms is taught by a teacher who doesn't even have a minor in the subject (Ingersoll, 1999).
- In at least one state, Illinois, nearly one in twelve practicing teachers failed a basic competency test; in schools serving high concentrations of low-income or minority youth, the number was one in four (Chicago Sun-Times, 2002). Similar patterns were found last year in New York City among uncertified teachers (New York Times, 2002).

In 1998, the U.S. Congress responded to the public's concerns with the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Title II of the Act adds a new requirement for states to hold institutions of higher education publicly accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce. The message was simple. Critical information on institutional performance could no longer be hidden from public view. Low-performing schools of education needed to be identified, then improved.

The first reports from the states are now in. But to read them, you would think that all the fuss about teacher quality is overblown:

- Many states, despite conflicting information in other sources, report that all—or nearly all—of their teachers are fully certified;
- Many institutions—indeed whole states—reported 100% pass rates on teacher licensure tests; and
- Only one of the more than 1,300 colleges that prepare teachers has been labeled low-performing, with just another 13 "at risk."

> ***. . . much of the reporting was inconsistent, incomplete, and utterly incomprehensible***

While some states clearly worked hard to meet the spirit of the law by providing clear, complete and comprehensible information, many simply obfuscated. These states provided data, often in overwhelming quantities. But much of the reporting was inconsistent, incomplete, and utterly incomprehensible.

In the end, the first public accounting of the quality of teacher preparation falls woefully short of providing policymakers and the public with basic information on how many of its teachers meet prescribed professional standards, how those teachers are distributed across districts and how well colleges and universities are preparing teachers to teach in a standards-based system. As such, it provides a wholly inadequate foundation for either public understanding or policy solutions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Congress sounds an alarm

In enacting new teacher quality provisions in the Higher Education Act, Congress intended to increase clarity and consistency of public reporting about the status of teacher education programs, and to ensure that states establish accountability measures for teacher preparation institutions.

States were asked to report on six dimensions of teacher preparation and performance:

1) standards for teachers;
2) requirements for certification/licensure;
3) assessment requirements and pass rates;
4) criteria for measuring program performance;
5) the number and distribution of teachers on waivers, or not fully certified; and,
6) state efforts to improve teacher quality.

State reporting would operate on an annual cycle beginning in 2001.

Overview of Title II State Reporting Requirements and Process

The legislation sets the following reporting cycle, which is to take place every year:

April 7, 2001

- **Colleges and universities** with teacher preparation programs must provide to the state by April 7 of each year information on program completer pass rates, basic features of the teacher preparation program, whether the program has been classified as "low-performing" by the state, and any other supplemental data.
- Institutions must also disclose this information to the public, both on request and through publications that are sent to potential applicants, guidance counselors or those who might employ program graduates.

The first round of institutional reports was made on April 9, 2001 by about 1,300 teacher preparation programs.

October 7, 2001

- **States** must report by October 7 each year to the U.S. Department of Education on indicators to assess the quality of teacher preparation:
- State licensure and certification requirements, including alternate routes
- Pass rates for licensure or certification candidates—statewide, by institution and for each alternate route, including rankings of institutions by licensure pass rates
- Information on waivers granted to state licensure or certification requirements—including the percentage of teachers on waivers in high and low poverty school districts
- Criteria used by the state to assess the performance of teacher preparation programs
- States may also report information about state teacher standards, efforts at improving teacher quality, or other supplemental data if applicable

The first set of annual state reports was made in Washington on October 8, 2001.

April 7, 2002

- **The U.S. Secretary of Education** must report to Congress and the public on the status of teacher preparation. The report is supposed to contain information on state licensure and certification requirements, alternate routes and waivers, profiles of teacher preparation policies and practices in each state, and a summary description of efforts in the states to improve teacher preparation and teacher quality.

The first of these was due on Capitol Hill by April 7, 2002.

Note: A comprehensive source of information about the Title II reporting system is on the web site maintained and updated for the U.S. Department of Education by a contractor at www.title2.org.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The intent of Congress was unmistakable. The public needed to be informed about the status of teacher preparation in their states and states needed to improve those institutions with low-performing teacher preparation programs.

The first full reports from states are now in. The Education Trust analyzed the state reported data as they appear on the U.S. Department of Education's Title II website. In addition, every attempt was made to explore state websites and/or contact state officials to clarify our understanding of their reports. By examining three key sections of those reports—waivers, assessments, and program performance—we sought to discover whether states meet the requirements—or at least the spirit—of the law. [See Appendix A for summary of initial findings]

Why should we care?

As we raise standards for all students, we place even greater importance on the role of teachers. New research makes it clear that teachers have the single greatest effect on student learning. Students who have several effective, well-prepared teachers in a row have the best chance to soar, while students who have even two ineffective teachers in a row are unlikely to ever recover (Sanders, 1996).

Because we now know that teachers have a direct and measurable impact on student learning, the new federal "No Child Left Behind" legislation places "high quality teachers" at the center of the national education reform agenda. All the more reason for people to care about the quality of programs that prepare new teachers and the mechanisms designed to ensure there is a qualified teacher in every classroom.

From worry to action

Against this backdrop of concern, the Congressional requirements that certain basic information be made public, and that states act to improve low performance, seem rather modest. But you wouldn't have thought so when those provisions were first proposed. Even though at least two states, Texas and New York, had already published data and designed accountability systems, the organizations representing higher education fought vehemently against making these data public elsewhere.

They lost, or at least they seemed to, when Congress approved the requirements overwhelmingly over their opposition. But our review of the state reports shows that in most states, those who prefer masking problems to unveiling them had their way after all. Data? Yes, and plenty of it. Comprehensible? Almost never.

Meeting the spirit of the law

Congress allowed for substantial leeway in how states could report data. Acknowledging that teacher preparation is largely a state and local function, the legislation grants states broad flexibility to set their own criteria for program performance and define a process by which institutions fall into "low performing" status and move out of it. While some may argue that there was no way to design a structure that would produce consistent and accurate reporting, Congress—in an effort to ensure meaningful public information—charged the Department with developing clear, reasonable, and common definitions for terms, and specific guidelines for data collection and uniform reporting methods.

The good news is there were states that seem to have gone out of their way to meet the spirit, as well as the letter, of the law. These states provided clear, complete and comprehensible information that fit key federal guidelines. Some states did so even though the resulting data revealed serious deficiencies or inequities. We commend these states for showing a commitment to understand the true nature of their teacher supply and quality problem through honest reporting.

- In the matter of teachers without full certification, for example, New Mexico and Texas laid bare for public scrutiny the severity of the problem in those two states. New Mexico's report not only shows alarmingly high numbers of underprepared teachers in the state as a whole, but also a huge gap in the distribution of teachers on waivers between high poverty and low poverty school districts—20% versus 8%. Texas data revealed a different sort of problem: distribution by district poverty was almost equal, but across the board the rate of teachers without full certification was consistently high at about 12%.
- There are also at least a few examples of clear state reporting on the performance of institutions that prepare teachers. Louisiana and North Carolina have both developed a systematic process that assigns performance ratings to institutions by using a "point" system based on several selected indicators, including Praxis II pass rates, graduate and/or employer surveys, and other measures. Both states provide descriptions of who will provide technical assistance to low-performing institutions, as well as of the consequences for those that do not improve. And unlike most states, Louisiana sets a timeline for how an institution moves from being identified as low-performing, to receiving assistance, to facing consequences/sanctions.
- Two states—Kentucky and Louisiana again—have gone well beyond the requirements of federal law in their commitment to inform their citizens by making the credentials of all of their teachers publicly available on their state websites.

On the whole, state reports reveal little

While the state Title II reports include a vast amount of data, the above examples are exceptions. Much of the reporting is inconsistent, incomplete, and incomprehensible. In the worst cases, the reports, if not technically dishonest, are surely misleading.

- **Only one teacher preparation institution in the nation was classified as low-performing** Consider, for example, that only one teacher education school among over 1,300 across the country was identified as low-performing. A scant 13 others were considered at-risk of being low performing.

Does this mean educators and policy makers are all wrong in their concern about the state of teacher preparation? Is it in great shape after all?

Hardly. A closer look at the reports reveals that many states simply did not answer the questions about low performance or reported criteria so vague or timelines so long that one had to wonder whether there was any intention to act. [See Chart 1]

Chart 1

Many States Slow to Hold Teacher Preparation Institutions Accountable

15 States did not report an implementation timeline (including 3 states that did not report any information)

6 States reported they will implement their criteria by 2003

30 States reported they have implemented their low- performing institutions criteria (including 1 by June 2002)

Even after states begin to hold institutions accountable to their program performance criteria, it can still be many years before institutions are actually identified as low-performing or even at-risk. Washington, D.C., perhaps the most egregious offender of the flexibility granted under the Title II law, describes a system that at the earliest may identify institutions as low-performing ten years from now.

New York and Texas Ahead of the Curve

Even before Title II requirements were in place, two states—New York and Texas—had implemented teacher preparation accountability systems.

New York:

- New York requires an 80% pass rate of program completers on certifying exams and meeting teacher education curricula standards in nine areas. The state began implementing these criteria in 1998-99.
- New York used existing state accountability criteria to fulfill the low-performing institution requirements set by Title II, HEA.

Texas:

- Similar to its K-12 accountability system, Texas requires teacher preparation institutions to be accountable for the performance of its subpopulations; 80% of each subgroup (i.e. race and poverty) must achieve a qualifying score on the ExCet. In 2002, the cut score increases to 85%.
- Texas created new criteria to fulfill the Title II low-performing institution requirements. These new criteria are based on the performance of "all students", and not by subgroups, and pass rate cut offs for federal purposes are set more lenient than in the state accountability system. Texas should make efforts to strengthen their program performance criteria for Title II to match their rigorous state criteria.

Source: Phyllis McClure, State Title II Plans draft report for the Education Trust (2000); and state reports on Title II website (2001).

□ **Suspiciously low number of teachers on waivers**

Just as the number of institutions identified as low-performing likely paints a false picture of reality, many states also reported suspiciously low numbers of teachers on waivers. Here the law is quite clear about criteria for who should be included in the waiver population. States must report those without initial regular certificate or license from any state, including those:

- holding temporary or emergency licenses or permits
- pursuing an alternative route to certification
- teaching as a long-term substitute

States must also report those teaching on provisional licenses, unless the only unmet condition is classroom teaching. For example, even after completing all program, course work and assessment requirements, new teachers in some states are granted only a provisional or probational license for the first stage of their teaching career—these teachers are not included in the waiver definition. However, in states where provisional licenses allow teachers to teach while they are in the process of fulfilling program, course work or assessment requirements, these teachers should be included in the waiver count.

But many states reported reduced numbers of teachers on waivers by excluding one or more categories in their definitions. States also reduced waiver numbers by reporting incomplete data.

- Georgia, South Dakota, Utah, West Virginia and Washington, D.C., for example, noted that they did not include long-term substitutes in their waiver populations. In addition, some states were clear about who they did and didn't include, while others were not, so it's possible that far greater numbers are unreported.
- South Carolina reported that only 5.4% of its teachers were not fully certified and that the distribution of these uncertified teachers was roughly equal across high- and low-poverty districts. A careful reading of the explanatory notes, however, indicates that the data include only 57 of 86 districts in the state, and that fully two-thirds of the high-poverty districts did not report. Just looking at the numbers, therefore, results in a incomplete understanding of the waiver situation in South Carolina.

In spite of missing data and variability of definitions across the states, one in five states still reported at least 10% of their teacher population on waivers.

At the opposite end of the spectrum, four states—Iowa, Nevada, Ohio, and Washington, D.C.—reported that they did not have even a single teacher on waivers. While laudable if taken at face value, these states warrant closer inspection to ensure that the quality and completeness of the data represent a true picture of the teacher force.

- Take for example Ohio, which reports that there are no teachers in the state that meet the federal waiver definition. While Ohio's Temporary Teaching License allows valid professional license holders to teach out-of-field, and thus, is legitimately not included as a waiver under the federal guidelines, the same is not true for another type of Temporary License—the Long-term Substitute License—which does not require an existing professional license. This Long-term Substitute License may be issued to holders of a baccalaureate degree with as little as 12 semester hours of coursework in the field for which the license is sought. These are one-year or five-year renewable licenses, so a long-term substitute can conceivably teach for decades without regular certification.
- Nevada also reports that it has no teachers in this category. However, Nevada grants "provisional three-year non-renewable licenses" for candidates who have not yet met all course work or testing provisions for an initial renewable license. Although a state official asserts that the most common provision for the non-renewable license is for out-of-state applicants already holding an initial license, a category excluded under federal guidelines, there are others, including those pursuing an alternate route—a category explicitly included in the federal waiver count description—who also teach under the provisional license.

While there may well be appropriate policy accommodations for those teaching without full certification, states still have a responsibility to share the complete story publicly. To their credit, several states acknowledged data collection or definition problems and stated specific efforts to remedy them. However, from the current state of data collection and reporting on these issues by many states, one could almost believe that they do not want to know just how many under-qualified teachers are in our classrooms.

Other key findings

Following are other key findings from our analysis.

1. **Many institutions, even whole states, have 100% pass rates on teacher licensure tests.** Looking only at the pass rates of institutions or states, one might again conclude that teacher preparation institutions are performing quite well. Several states and a surprisingly high number of institutions report pass rates of 100%.

   However, pass rates on licensure tests *can* provide a misleading picture of quality, especially when we look at *when* these institutions and states require candidates to pass the assessments. For example:

   - Nearly half the states that require teacher candidates to pass basic skills tests actually require those tests for program entry and/or prior to completion. In many other states, a large proportion of *institutions* have the same policy. For example, 28 of 29 Alabama institutions require passing the basic skills tests before entry. In these states and institutions, then, those pass rates are automatically 100%.
   - In West Virginia, Michigan, and Oregon, passing the content area and/or professional knowledge assessments is also required prior

to program completion, resulting in a clean 100% pass rate across all reported assessments for program completers in every college and university.

Requiring undergraduates to pass these tests prior to program completion is one way to assure that a teaching degree means something. But it also guarantees a 100% pass rate because, by definition, graduates of the education program have passed the test. Reporting pass rates in these circumstances reveals nothing about how many aspiring graduates took the test but failed. As a result, the burden of accountability shifts away from the institution and falls completely on the shoulders of the individual.

But even when we exclude institutions requiring students to pass examinations before designating them as completers, institutional pass rates show little variation—except for the odd outliers at the low end. Even among the quartile of institutions with the lowest pass rates within each state, the mean pass rate rarely drops below 80%.

Why? The reason is clear with even a cursory review of typical licensure tests. As the AFT pointed out in its 2000 report, current state examinations "vary greatly and often are characterized by low-level content and low passing scores." Indeed, the cut-scores set by states are

Do Teacher Licensing Requirements Measure Up to Other Professions?

Unlike many other professions that require a single, rigorous exam across the country and substantial experience in the field, teacher licensure requirements are highly variable and largely low level.

Depending on where and what you teach, the number and types of exams required are selected from over 600 different exams. Most of these exams are short multiple choice tests. Few states use exams known to have content that exceeds the high school level, and most set low cut scores for these exams.

And it gets worse. Compare the 9-18 weeks of student teaching typically required for teacher candidates to the four years of field experience required of professional engineers, or the almost three year equivalent required of architects.

While professional standards for teaching are clearly recognized as a local responsibility, states must confront the wide variability and low expectations in their standards for teacher preparation. In order to ensure that future teachers can meet the demands for higher student standards and achievement, states must move to strengthen both their expectations of teacher preparation, and their assessment systems in place to measure high quality preparation.

Comparison of Licensing Requirements for Teaching and Other Professions (K. Schmitt, in National Research Council, 2001)

Profession	Education	Experience	Exam Required	Test format
Teaching	All states require BA in Education or content area: most have post-baccalaureate alternatives	Student teaching: varies from 9-18 weeks	Over 600 exams in use; most states require one or more basic skills, general knowledge, subject matter or professional knowledge test	Primarily multiple choice and constructed response; individual tests generally 2 hours
Architects	About 1/4 of states require 5-year degree from accredited program; others accept alternative ways to satisfy requirements	Most states require 5,600 hours (140—40 hour weeks) of defined experience	1 exam with 9 sections	Computer simulation; 6 multiple choice sections; 3 vignette sections with graphics problems
Certified Public Accountants	Most states require BA/BS. Most require 150 hours of education prior to taking the test	Most states require experience, between 1-3 years	4 exams; must pass all 4. Some require ethics course/exam.	Multiple choice, essay, matching, short answer and fill in the blank. 15 hours, 2 days.
Registered Nurses	Most states require BA, BS in Nursing	No experience required	1 exam	Computer adaptive, multiple choice; 5 hours.
Professional Engineers	Most states require Bachelors in engineering	All states require experience, generally 4 years	2 part exam; must pass both; some also have ethics, jurisprudence, specialty exams	Multiple choice and problems; 8 hours per part.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

highly variable and embarrassingly low across the board. Take Virginia, which has the highest cut-scores across the basic skills tests. To achieve its cut scores in reading, candidates still only have to successfully answer 71-76% of the test items. Most of the other cut scores require from 40% to 60% correct—a failing mark in any other testing system. (Education Trust, 1999)

2. **Some states still have painfully weak assessment systems, or no teacher assessment systems at all.** The assessment requirements in seven states are especially troublesome because they require only basic skills tests for their teacher candidates. [See Chart 2]

Chart 2

7 States Require ONLY Low-Level Basic Skills Tests

Of those, 3 states require tests before entry into teacher preparation programs.

California
Montana
Wisconsin

And 4 states require tests for licensure

Alabama
Delaware
Maine
New York

- In Alabama, Delaware, Maine and New York the sole testing required for *licensure* is what twelve other states require for *admission* to their teacher preparation programs. In other words, teachers entering the classroom in these four states are only assessed on what others must demonstrate in 12 other states even before entering teacher preparation programs.
- Montana, Wisconsin and California also require only basic skills tests of teacher candidates, but these states actually require them for entry and/or program completion.

In spite of strong evidence relating student achievement and teachers' knowledge of the subject they teach, an astounding 23 states do not require subject area content knowledge tests for both secondary English and Mathematics. We commend the states that have already begun to assess academic content knowledge. [See Chart 3]

Chart 3

Heading in the Right Direction: Some States Testing Subject Matter Knowledge

28 states require content knowledge assessments for both secondary English Language Arts and Mathematics.

AR, CO, CT, DC, FL, GA, HI, IL, IN, KY, MD, MA, MI, MS, MO, NV, NH, NJ, NC, OH, OK, OR, PA, SC, TN, TX, VA, WV

But even states with weak or partial assessments systems look virtuous compared to states that make no effort to screen out even the weakest applicants. [See Charts 4 and 5]

- Eleven states have no subject matter testing requirements.
- Eight more states still don't even have a statewide assessment system in place.

Chart 4

Many States Don't Test Where it Counts

11 states require no content knowlege assessments

Alabama, California, Delaware, Kansas, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, Rhode Island, Wisconsin

Chart 5

And Some States Don't Test At All

8 States with no assessment system

Arizona, Idaho, Iowa
North Dakota, South Dakota
Utah, Washington, Wyoming

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Although most of these states can point to either academic course work requirements or content standards for teacher candidates, the absence of any measure to assure that prospective teachers learn the content provides parents and the public very little protection.

3. **Most states have shockingly large differences in the distribution of uncertified teachers between high-poverty districts and others.**
Last but by no means least, even the rather incomplete data assembled in these reports paints a shocking portrait of how little we care about who teaches our poorest children. Across 30 of the 41 states that reported teacher waiver data by district poverty, there is a pervasive pattern of disparity. High-poverty districts were far more likely to be staffed with teachers who have not met the state's minimum professional requirements.
   - In the 2000 districts year, for example, California reported 23% of its teachers in high-poverty districts teaching on waivers compared to 13% elsewhere.
   - In New York, 17% of the teachers in high-poverty districts were teaching on waivers, compared to 4% elsewhere in the state.

Public reporting with no caveats

The intent of Title II is clear. States must take responsibility to disclose honest and useful information to the public about the condition of teacher preparation in their state. They must also hold higher education accountable for the quality of teachers they prepare. The new provisions of the "No Child Left Behind" legislation lend even more urgency to the challenge by requiring that all students have the benefit of fully qualified teachers to help them meet high standards of learning.

If we are really committed to making sure teachers have the knowledge they need to teach all students to high levels, states must embrace the spirit of Title II and make information about teacher preparation and quality public and transparent. There can be no room for equivocation, no caveats to interpret with caution. Only by sharing data that is clear, complete and comprehensible can states begin to understand, monitor and improve the status of teaching and teacher preparation. Used in this way, Title II becomes a springboard to action on the larger goal – providing good teachers in every school and classroom.

What States Should Do:

When Congress reauthorizes the Higher Education Act in 2003, members may want to revisit the requirements of the law. In the meantime, the challenge is for states to live up to the spirit of Title II by taking action toward understanding, monitoring and improving the status of teaching and teacher preparation. States should take responsibility and use this opportunity to prepare and provide good teachers in every school and classroom. Along these lines, we offer the following suggestions.

1. ***Supply AND Quality.*** While we are acutely aware of the struggle with teacher supply, it is highly important that concerns about quantity not scare us into inaction on quality. Despite efforts to convince policymakers otherwise, the two are not mutually exclusive. Indeed, policymakers can actually combine these goals by creating accountability systems that ask institutions not only to increase the success rates of program completers on, for example, rigorous licensure exams, but also ask institutions to increase the number of program completers, especially in shortage areas. There is some precedent here. West Virginia, for example, has included the quantity of teachers produced in its institutional accountability system. And several public university systems—including Texas A&M and the California State University System—have established numeric goals for their own campuses.

2. ***More Rigorous Licensure Examinations.*** Unlike in many other professions, the tests required of future teachers are varied (more than 600 at last count) and mostly low-level. We join the American Federation of Teachers in calling on "the teaching profession under the auspices of a respected body of scholars and educators (such as the National Academy of Sciences, the learned societies or a specially assembled body) to develop examinations in subject matter and pedagogy to be taken by all prospective teachers prior to licensure in their teaching field. These new examinations should aim for a level of rigor that is consistent with what entry-level teachers in other high-performing countries are expected to know." But states don't have to wait. States can increase the rigor of their assessment systems by any of the following actions: using the most rigorous available exam; raising the cut-score on the existing exam; or even using the state's high school assessment, if that is more rigorous (in some states, it is).

3. ***Institutional Accountability Systems With Substance.*** Obviously, if institutions require tests for admission or program completion, these same tests cannot serve the purpose of institutional accountability. So, too, accountability systems that depend entirely on program review, for neither of these approaches adequately evaluates whether colleges and universities are doing a responsible job of equipping their graduates with the knowledge and skills they need to be effective teachers. It is not necessarily wrong to require applicants for admission to teacher preparation programs to pass basic skills tests. These, after all, are generally tests of high school level skills. But to require students to pass content or professional knowledge tests before certifying them as completers—even if they have completed everything else—is simply a dodge of institutional responsibility.

   Performance on licensure tests is, however, but one measure of how well institutions are preparing teachers. As quickly as possible, states should expand their systems in the directions taken by Georgia—which includes not just pass rates but also principal survey data and program review—and

Louisiana, whose new system includes first-year teacher mentor ratings and number of completers in critical shortage areas.

Also, now that the new No Child Left Behind Act requires states to have annual grade 3-8 testing, states will have increasing ability to examine the impact of individual teachers—and, therefore, the real success of the institutions that produced them—on actual student learning. If, as stated in the goals of the University System of Georgia, the real role of colleges and universities is to produce teachers who are "effective in getting diverse learners to high standards", then actually measuring that effectiveness in value-added terms is an appropriate step. States would be remiss not to use this opportunity to evaluate institutional effectiveness.

4. ***Not One Shot.*** Assuring teacher quality ought not be considered a single step. As quickly as possible, states should develop multiple and more accurate measures to ensure that teachers develop the understandings necessary to teach a concept well to all students. Connecticut's Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) system, for example, requires teachers to submit systematic work samples, video tapes of classroom teaching, and reflective analyses of student work.

5. ***A Fair Chance for Poor Children.*** Ample research shows that the cumulative effects of poor teaching are devastating for children. Yet we persist in assigning the least qualified teachers to the neediest students year after year. While most states and indeed cities have yet to confront these inequities head on, some are acting in ways that other states should adopt.
   - In New York State, for example, Commissioner of Education Rick Mills has prohibited low-performing schools—most of them serving concentrations of poor children—from hiring even a single uncredentialled teacher.
   - In California, Governor Gray Davis proposed—and the legislature funded—a bonus system to attract Board Certified Teachers to high-poverty schools.
   - In Charlotte, North Carolina, Superintendent Eric Smith enacted a system of incentives that both provided pay enhancements and reduced class sizes in low-performing schools.
   - In Chattanooga, Tennessee, the Mayor proposed—and the city council funded—an incentive system to provide pay bonuses to unusually effective teachers willing to teach in low-performing schools.
   - In Louisiana, the state requires districts to report the proportion of uncertified teachers in the district as a whole and also the proportion of uncertified teachers in the highest poverty/lowest performing schools, then subtracts points in the state accountability system when the high-poverty schools have a larger fraction.

6. ***Honest Data, Publicly Reported.*** It may sometimes seem prudent, in this era of declining confidence in public institutions, to hide data away and otherwise obfuscate the problem. But such actions often boomerang, and lead to even sharper declines in public confidence. In our experience, it's better to get simple and honest data out on the table, then invite the public in to help shape solutions.

References

American Federation of Teachers. *Building a Profession: Strengthening Teacher Preparation and Induction,* Report of the K-16 Teacher Education Task Force, April 2000.

Chicago Sun-Times, Series on Teacher Quality, 2001. www.suntimes.com/special_sections/failing_teacher/

The Education Trust. "Not Good Enough: A Content Analysis of Teacher Licensing Examinations", *Thinking K-16,* Vol. 3, Issue 1, Spring 1999.

Educational Testing Service. Praxis Series State Requirements and Cut Scores, www.ets.org/praxis/prxstate.html.

Ingersoll, Richard. *American Educational Researcher,* "The Problem of Underqualified Teachers in American Secondary Schools", vol. 28, no. 2, March 1999, p. 29.

National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future,* September, 1996.

National Research Council. *Testing Teacher Candidates: The Role of Licensure Tests in Improving Teacher Quality,* March 2001.

The New York Times. Zhou Yilu, "Many Teachers Keep Failing Test for Certification", April 29, 2002.

Public Education Network/Education Week National Survey of Public Opinion. "Accountability for All: What Voters Want from Education Candidates", April 2002.

Sanders, William, and June Rivers. "Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Students Academic Achievement." University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center. November, 1996.

State Department of Education Web sites.

U.S. Department of Education. *Initial Report of the Secretary on the Quality of Teacher Preparation.* Washington, D.C.: 2000.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *Reference and Reporting Guide for Preparing State and Institutional Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation: Title II, Higher Education Act,* NCES 2000-089. Washington, DC: 2000.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *Teacher Quality: A Report on The Preparation and Qualifications of Public School Teachers.* Washington, D.C.: January 1999.

U.S. Department of Education. Title II Web site, www.title2.org.

Authors: Sandra Huang, *policy associate*
Yun Yi, *policy associate*
Kati Haycock, *director*

Editor: Patte Barth, *senior associate*

Research Assistants: Rachel Kelly
Karen Edell

Graphic Design: Autumn Richardson, *graphics editor*

Useful Web Links:

Link to the Title II State Reports -- http://www.title2.org

Link to Title II Statutory Provisions/Sections 207 & 208 – http://www.title2.org/REFREPGUIDE.PDF (see Appendix A on page 38)

Appendices:

- APPENDIX A: Methodology and Summary of Primary Findings
- APPENDIX B: Number and Distribution of Teachers on Waivers, or Those Not Fully Certified, as reported in Title II State Reports, 2001
- APPENDIX C: Teacher Licensure Assessments Requirements: What Do States Require and When?
- APPENDIX D: Who's Using What: Which Teacher Licensure Assessment Systems are States Using?
- APPENDIX E: States Using Praxis Series (ETS) Assessments: Tests Required and State Cut Scores, 2000-2001
- APPENDIX F: States Using National Evaluation Systems (NES) Developed Assessments: Tests Required and State Cut Scores, 2000-2001

APPENDIX A: Methodology and Summary of Primary Findings

The Education Trust analyzed the state reported data in the following three dimensions as they appear on the U.S. Department of Education's Title II website (www.title2.org). In addition, every attempt was made to explore state websites and/or contact state officials to clarify our understanding of their reports. By examining these key sections of the state reports, we sought to discover whether states meet the requirements—and the spirit—of the law.

Teachers on Waivers

What Title II required states to report:

- Total number of teachers in the state
- Total number of teachers on waivers (not fully certified)
- Total number teachers on waivers who have sufficient content expertise (major in field OR passed content assessment)
- Teacher distribution by subject area and teacher distribution by high poverty districts

Some of our initial findings:

- 41 states reported data on the distribution of teachers on waivers between high-poverty and other districts. 30 states showed disparities between high-poverty and other districts.
- At least 7 states indicated they could not report all categories or breakdowns of waivers data as required by federal guidelines because of their existing data collection policy/system.
- 4 states reported zero teachers on waivers/not fully certified.

Teacher Assessments

What Title II required states to report:

- State assessment requirements
- Pass rates for each institution in state
- Institutions with teacher education programs that require an assessment before entry or exiting a program

Some of our initial findings:

- 39 states require a basic skills test; 20 require a pedagogy test; 28 require a content level test in English Language Arts, 32 require a content level test in mathematics.
- With few exceptions, summary and aggregate pass rates are uniformly high.
- States that require the passage of an assessment prior to program entry and/or completion: basic skills test—19; content area test—3; and pedagogy test—2.
- 8 states do not have an assessment system.

Teacher Preparation Program Performance

What Title II required states to report:

- Description of state criteria for assessing the performance of teacher preparation programs
- Description of state criteria for identifying and providing assistance to low-performing institutions
- List of institutions that have been identified as low-performing, or at-risk of becoming low-performing

Some of our initial findings:

- 1 teacher preparation institution in all 50 states was identified as low-performing.
- 13 teacher preparation institutions in 5 states were identified as at-risk of low-performing.
- 30 states report they have implemented their criteria (including 1 by June 2002); 6 states report they will implement by 2003.
- 15 states did not report an implementation timeline; of these 3 did not report any information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B: Number and Distribution of Teachers on Waivers, or Those Not Fully Certified, as Reported in Title II State Reports, 2001

Interpret data with caution! The data reported in this table should be interpreted with caution. Data are self-reported, and states were inconsistent in their adherence to federal waiver definitions. Data reporting capacity also varied across states, so some states have data that exclude certain waiver categories, or data that are simply incomplete. **Comparisons cannot be made across states.** Be aware also that even the picture within a state may be misleading (see South Carolina example, page 5 of text).

State	State Total– # Teachers	State Total– # Teachers Not Fully Certified	State Total– Percent Not Fully Certified	High Poverty Districts– Percent Not Fully Certified	All Other Districts– Percent Not Fully Certified
Alabama	47855	935	2.0%	3.4%	1.7%
Alaska	8117	109	1.3%	NA	NA
Arizona	43580	7106	16.3%	NA	NA
Arkansas	27428	339	1.2%	1.9%	1.1%
California	284628	45489	16.0%	22.7%	13.0%
Colorado	42799	1142	2.7%	5.0%	2.2%
Connecticut	55976	38	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Delaware	7516	464	6.2%	7.0%	6.0%
District of Columbia	5044	0	0.0%	NA	NA
Florida	107607	3692	3.4%	5.5%	3.3%
Georgia	91467	8747	9.6%	5.1%	4.6%
Hawaii	11142	991	8.9%	10.0%	8.6%
Idaho	13714	330	2.4%	6.5%	2.0%
Illinois	132692	3520	2.7%	5.4%	1.2%
Indiana	132896	1141	0.9%	1.1%	0.8%
Iowa	38624	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Kansas	39277	95	0.2%	0.6%	0.2%
Kentucky	40068	375	0.9%	0.3%	1.1%
Louisiana	55429	8399	15.2%	23.3%	13.5%
Maine	16348	35	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%
Maryland	53500	7126	13.3%	18.8%	11.3%
Massachusetts	64198	161	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%
Michigan	111789	2288	2.0%	0.2%	2.5%
Minnesota	90636	307	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%
Mississippi	31017	1684	5.4%	8.8%	4.8%
Missouri	65389	1803	2.8%	5.7%	2.2%
Montana	10323	30	0.3%	NA	NA
Nebraska	26014	83	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
Nevada	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Hampshire	10240	96	0.9%	0.8%	1.1%
New Jersey	98072	1815	1.9%	2.9%	1.4%
New Mexico	21467	2187	10.2%	20.2%	8.4%
New York	211073	20602	9.8%	17.0%	3.8%
North Carolina	85867	13484	15.7%	18.0%	15.4%
North Dakota	8603	15	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%
Ohio	111000	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oklahoma	49607	80	0.2%	NA	NA
Oregon	26088	638	2.4%	2.1%	2.5%
Pennsylvania	118080	953	0.8%	2.1%	0.3%
Rhode Island	11854	56	0.5%	0.9%	0.2%
South Carolina	33426	1819	5.4%	5.4%	5.4%
South Dakota	9493	12	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%
Tennessee	56818	1828	3.2%	9.0%	1.7%
Texas	280108	32228	11.5%	12.7%	11.2%
Utah	35288	2535	7.2%	6.9%	7.2%
Vermont	8472	113	1.3%	NA	NA
Virginia	86415	5838	6.8%	3.0%	7.6%
Washington	57504	122	0.2%	NA	NA
West Virginia	21839	931	4.3%	4.4%	4.2%
Wisconsin	59994	775	1.3%	2.1%	0.9%
Wyoming	8307	10	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%

NA = Not Applicable (data may be missing so the percentage cannot be calculated)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX C: Teacher Licensure Assessment Requirements: What Do States Require and When? Title II State Reports, 2001

E = Entry into Program; **C = Prior to Program Completion;**
L = for Licensure **Subscript $_S$ (i.e., L_S) = subject-specific pedagogy**

Assessment requirements for licensure vary greatly by state, both in what is required and at what stage candidates must meet them. For example, some states require passing the same assessments for licensure, or for teachers entering the classroom, as other states require before entry into their teacher preparation programs.

State	Basic Skills ONLY	Basic Skills	Subject Area Knowledge			Professional Knowledge/Pedagogy
			Elementary Ed	Math	ELA	
Alabama	X	L				
Alaska		L		L		
Arizona			No state assessment system			
Arkansas		E, C	L	L	L	L, L_S
California	X	C				
Colorado			L	L	L	
Connecticut		E	L	L	L	
DC		L	L	L	L	L_S
Delaware	X	L				
Florida		L	L	L	L	
Georgia		E	L	L	L	L
Hawaii		L	L	L	L	L, L_S
Idaho			No state assessment system			
Illinois		E	L	L	L	
Indiana		L	L	L	L	
Iowa			No state assessment system			
Kansas		L				L
Kentucky		E	C	C	C	
Louisiana		E	L	L		L, L_S
Maine	X	L				
Maryland		L	L	L	L	L_S
Massachusetts		L	L	L	L	
Michigan		E, C	C	C	C	
Minnesota		L	L	L		
Mississippi		E	L	L	L	L
Missouri		E,C	L	L	L	
Montana	X	E, C				
Nebraska		E, C				
Nevada		L	L	L	L	L, L_S
New Hampshire		L		L	L	
New Jersey			L	L	L	
New Mexico		E, C				L
New York	X	L				
North Carolina		L	L	L	L	L_S
North Dakota			No state assessment system			
Ohio			L	L	L	L
Oklahoma		L	L	L	L	L
Oregon		E		E**, C	E**, C	C_S
Pennsylvania		L	L	L	L	L
Rhode Island						L
South Carolina		E	L	L	L	L
South Dakota			No state assessment system			
Tennessee		E	L	L	L	L, L_S
Texas		E	L	L	L	L
Utah			No state assessment system			
Vermont		L	L	L		
Virginia		L		L	L	
Washington			No state assessment system			
West Virginia		E	C	C	C	C
Wisconsin	X	E				
Wyoming			No state assessment system			

Institutions choose which test will fulfill state requirement
**Fifth year teacher preparation programs in Oregon require students to take the content assessments prior to program entry.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D: Who's Using What: Which Teacher Licensure Assessment Systems are States Using?

See following appendices for specifics on states using ETS/Praxis, or NES Assessments

ETS/Praxis (33)	NES (9)	No Assessment System (8)
Alaska	California	Arizona
Arkansas	Colorado	Idaho
Connecticut	Illinois	Iowa
Delaware	Massachusetts	North Dakota
District of Columbia	Michigan	South Dakota
Florida	New Mexico	Utah
Georgia	New York	Washington
Hawaii	Oklahoma[2]	Wyoming
Indiana	Texas[3]	
Kansas		
Kentucky		
Louisiana		
Maine	**At Least One State Developed Test (3)**	
Maryland		
Minnesota		
Mississippi	Alabama	
Missouri		
Montana	Florida (ETS)	
Nebraska	Missouri (ETS)	
Nevada		
New Hampshire		
New Jersey		
North Carolina		
Ohio		
Oregon[1]		
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
Tennessee		
Vermont		
Virginia		
West Virginia		
Wisconsin		

[1]Oregon uses primarily ETS/Praxis assessments, but offers California's CBEST (NES developed) basic skills test as alternative

[2]Oklahoma uses primarily NES developed assessments, but the Praxis basic skills tests must be taken by all students seeking entry into teacher training programs who do not meet the grade-point average (GPA) requirement.

[3]Texas uses primarily NES developed assessments, but the Praxis basic skills tests is required for all alternative route candidates.

APPENDIX E: States Using Praxis [ETS] Assessment: Tests Required and State Cut Scores 2001-2002

This appendix contains a listing of the Praxis assessments developed and administered by the Education Testing Service (ETS). The list includes the Praxis Series tests used by states in the teacher certification and licensure process. Included are assessments and cut scores in: Basic skills, professional knowledge, subject area knowledge—including both content knowledge and pedagogy--for the areas of elementary education, English, and mathematics. We reported the cut scores directly from the ETS Praxis series website, as these reflect the scoring scale change that align the CBT to the PPST scale. The CBT cut scores below will be different from those reported in the Title II state reports. (Source: Educational Testing Service, The Praxis Series Online, State Requirements page—http://www.ets.org/praxis/prxstate.html; all state pages updated between January–May 2002)

	Basic Skills Praxis I						Professional Knowledge Praxis II		
	PPST: Math	PPST: Reading	PPST: Writing	CBT: Math	CBT: Reading	CBT: Writing	PLT: Grades K-6	PLT: Grades 5-9	PLT: Grades 7-12
Test Number	10730	10710	10720	731	721	731	10522	10523	10524
Score Range	150-190	150-190	150-190	150-190	150-190	150-190	100-200	100-200	100-200
Performance IQR/ Median*	173-183 178	174-182 178	173-178 175	—— ——	—— ——	—— ——	166-181 173	166-181 174	168-183 176
Alaska	173	175	174	173	175	174			
Arkansas	171	172	173	171	172	173	164	164	164
Connecticut	171	172	171	171	172	171			
Delaware	174	175	173	174	175	173			
District of Colum	174	172	171	174	172	171			
Florida	175	172	171	175	172	171			
Georgia	176	176	174	176	176	174		166	
Hawaii	173	172	171	173	172	171	163	157	157
Indiana	175	176	172	320	176	172			
Kansas	174	173	172	173	172	172	161	161	161
Kentucky	173	173	172	173	173	172			
Louisiana	170	172	171	170	172	171	161		161
Maine	175	176	175	175	176	175			
Maryland	177	177	173	173	177	173			
Minnesota	169	173	172	169	173	172			
Mississippi	169	170	172	169	170	172	152	152	152
Missouri								160	160
Montana	170	170	170	170	170	170			
Nebraska	171	170	172	171	170	172	pilot study for 2000-01		
Nevada	172	174	172	172	174	172	169		161
New Hampshire	172	174	172	172	174	172			
New Jersey									
North Carolina	173	176	173	173	176	173			
Ohio							168	168	165
Oklahoma**	171	173	172	171	173	172			
Oregon**	175	174	171	175	174	171			
Pennsylvania	173	172	173	173	172	173	167		167
Rhode Island							167		167
South Carolina	172	175	173	172	175	173	165	165	165
Tennessee	173	174	173	173	174	173	155	154	159
Texas**	171	172	173	171	172	173			
Vermont	175	177	174	175	177	174			
Virginia	178(532)	178(532)	176(532)	178	178	176			
West Virginia	172	174	172	172	174	172	165	159	156
Wisconsin	173	175	174	173	175	174			

PPST = Pre-Professional Skills Tests; CBT = Computer-Based Testing; PLT = Principals of learning and Teaching

*The Performance IQR is the Inter-Quartile Range, or the score range from the 25th to the 75th percentile. For example, if the IQR is 173-183, 173 is at the 25th percentile, among those who took the test; 183 marks the 75th percentile. Said differently, only 25% of test takers scored at or below 173. We highlight this because most state cut scores are set at or below the 25th percentile. No data for CBT because scoring scale was changed in 2001.

**See foot notes in Appendix D

→

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX E: States Using Praxis [ETS] Assessment: Tests Required and State Cut Scores 2000-2001

	Subject Area Knowledge: Praxis II				
	Elementary				
	Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction & Assessments	Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction & Assessments K-6	Elementary Education: Content Knowledge	Education in Elementary School	Elementary Education: Content Area Exercises
Test Number	10011	10016	10014	20010	20012
Score Range	100-200	100-200	100-200	250-990	100-200
Performance IQR/ Median*	169-188 179	156-176 165	150-180 166	580-670 630	146-160 153
Alaska					
Arkansas				500	
Connecticut	163				148
Delaware					
District of Columbia	146				148
Florida	151 OR			560 OR	
Georgia		154			137
Hawaii	164				135
Indiana	143				
Kansas					
Kentucky	163				
Louisiana	156				137
Maine					
Maryland			142		150
Minnesota			140		
Mississippi		135			
Missouri	164				
Montana					
Nebraska	pilot 2000-01				
Nevada	158				135
New Hampshire					
New Jersey			133		
North Carolina	313 combined				313 combined
Ohio	162				
Oklahoma**					
Oregon**					
Pennsylvania	168		142		
Rhode Island					
South Carolina	164				145
Tennessee	159				not set yet
Texas**					
Vermont			148		
Virginia					
West Virginia	155				
Wisconsin					

*The Performance IQR is the Inter-Quartile Range, or the score range from the 25th to the 75th percentile. For example, if the IQR is 173-183, 173 is at the 25th percentile, among those who took the test; 183 marks the 75th percentile. Said differently, only 25% of test takers scored at or below 173. We highlight this because most state cut scores are set at or below the 25th percentile.

**See foot notes in Appendix D

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX E: States Using Praxis [ETS] Assessment: Tests Required and State Cut Scores 2000-2001

	Subject Area Knowledge: Praxis II--Secondary							
	English			Mathematics				
	English Language, Literature and Composition: Content Knowledge	English Language, Literature and Composition: Pedagogy	English Language, Literature and Composition: Essays	Mathematics (calc allowed)	Mathematics: Content Knowledge (graphing calc req'd)	Mathematics: Pedagogy (calc prohibited)	Mathematics: Proofs, Models & Problems Part I (graphing calc req'd)	Mathematics: Proofs, Models & Problems Part II (graphing calc req'd)
Test Number	10041	30043	20042	10060	10061	20065	20063	20064
Score Range	100-200	100-200	100-200	250-990	100-200	100-200	100-200	100-200
Performance IQR/ Median*	165-188 177	145-165 155	155-170 160	540-660 590	131-156 143	130-155 140	142-175 158	133-167 150
Alaska					146		171	
Arkansas	159	145	150	530	136	135	144	
Connecticut	172		160		137			
Delaware								
District of Columbia	142	150			141	135	154	
Florida	165			600 (G5-9) 620 (G6-12)				
Georgia	168		150		136		150	
Hawaii	164	150			136	135		
Indiana	153			530	136			
Kansas								
Kentucky	160		154		125		141	
Louisiana	160	130		550				
Maine								
Maryland	164	155			141	145		
Minnesota					131			
Mississippi	157				123			
Missouri	158				137			
Montana								
Nebraska								
Nevada		150	155		144/133	135		
New Hampshire	164		155		127		140	
New Jersey	155				130			
North Carolina	321 combined				281 combined			
Ohio	167				139			
Oklahoma**								
Oregon**	164		145		147	140	144	140
Pennsylvania	160				136			
Rhode Island								
South Carolina	162		150	560	131			
Tennessee	157	145	150		136	125		
Texas**								
Vermont					141		154	
Virginia	172				147			
West Virginia	155				133			
Wisconsin								

*The Performance IQR is the Inter-Quartile Range, or the score range from the 25th to the 75th percentile. For example, if the IQR is 173-183, 173 is at the 25th percentile, among those who took the test; 183 marks the 75th percentile. Said differently, only 25% of test takers scored at or below 173. We highlight this because most state cut scores are set at or below the 25th percentile.

**See foot notes in Appendix D

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX F: States Using National Evaluation Systems (NES) Developed Assessments: Tests required and State Cut Scores, 2000-2001

This appendix contains a listing of the assessments administered by the National Evaluation Systems, Inc. for the teacher certification and licensure process. Included are assessments in: Basic skills, professional knowledge and subject matter knowledge for elementary education, English and Mathematics. (Source: U.S. Department of Education, The Initial Report of the Secretary on the Quality of Teacher Preparation, 2000. Appendix B; Updated with data from Title II State Reports, 2001, on U.S. DOE Title 2 Website—www.title2.org)

State	State Assessment System/Tests		Passing Score	Scale
California	**CALIFORNIA PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR CALIFORNIA TEACHERS**			
	Basic Skills	California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST): Reading	123	60-240
		CBEST: Writing		
		CBEST: Mathematics		
		Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA): Video performance assessment	17	6-24
		Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA): Written exam	81	0-120
Colorado	**PROGRAM FOR LICENSING ASSESSMENTS FOR COLORADO EDUCATORS (PLACE)**			
	Academic Content	Elementary Education	220	100- 300
		Mathematics	220	100- 300
		English	220	100- 300
Illinois	**ILLINOIS CERTIFICATION TESTING SYSTEM (ICTS)**			
	Basic Skills	ICTS Basic Skills Test: Mathematics	70	0-100
		ICTS Basic Skills Test: Grammar	70	0-100
		ICTS Basic Skills Test: Reading	70	0-100
		ICTS Basic Skills Test: Writing	70	0-100
	Professional knowledge	Elementary	70	0-100
	Academic Content	English	70	0-100
		Mathematics	70	0-100
Massachusetts	**MASSACHUSETTS TEACHER TESTS (MTT)**			
	Basic Skills	Communication and Literacy Skills Test	70	0-100
	Professional knowledge	Early Childhood, Elementary, or Middle School	70	0-100
	Academic Content	English	70	0-100
		Mathematics	70	0-100
Michigan	**MICHIGAN TEST FOR TEACHER CERTIFICATION (MTTC)**			
	Basic Skills	Basic Skills: Math	220	100- 300
		Basic Skills: Reading	220	100- 300
		Basic Skills: Writing	220	100- 300
	Academic Content	Elementary Education	220	100- 300
		English	220	100- 300
		Mathematics	220	100- 300
		Language Arts	220	100- 300
New Mexico	**NEW MEXICO TEACHER ASSESSMENTS (NMTA)**			
	Basic Skills	New Mexico Assessment of Teacher Basic Skills	240	100- 300
		New Mexico Assessment of Teacher General Knowledge	240	100- 300

→

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX F: States Using National Evaluation Systems (NES) Developed Assessments: Tests required and State Cut Scores, 2000-2001

State	State Assessment System/Tests		Passing Score	Scale
New Mexico				
		New Mexico Assessment of Teacher Competency—Elementary	240	100- 300
		New Mexico Assessment of Teacher Competency—Secondary	240	100- 300
New York	**NEW YORK STATE TEACHER CERTIFICATION EXAMINATIONS (NYSTCE)**			
	Professional Knowledge	Elementary Assessment of Teaching Skills, Written (ATS- W)	220	100- 300
		Secondary Assessment of Teaching Skills, Written (ATS- W)	220	100- 300
	Other Content	Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAST)	220	100- 300
Oklahoma	**CERTIFICATION EXAMINATIONS FOR OKLAHOMA EDUCATORS (CEOE)**			
	Basic Skills	Oklahoma General Education Test (OGET)	240	100-300
		Oklahoma Professional Teaching Exam (OPTE)	240	100-300
	Professional Knowledge	Early Childhood	240	100-300
		Elementary/Middle Level	240	100-300
		Middle Level/Secondary	240	100-300
		Oklahoma Subject Area Tests	240	100-300
	Academic Content	OSAT: Middle Level/ Intermediate Mathematics	240	100-300
		OSAT: Advanced Mathematics	240	100-300
		OSAT: English	240	100-300
Oregon	**OREGON TEST PASSING SCORE SCALE***			
	Basic Skills	California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST): Reading	37	20-80
		California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST): Writing	37	20-80
		California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST): Mathematics	37	20-80
Texas	**EXAMINATION FOR THE CERTIFICATION OF EDUCATORS IN TEXAS (ExCET)**			
	Basic Skills	Local Assessment of College Level Skills	...	...
	Professional Knowledge	ExCET Early Childhood Education	70	0-100
		ExCET Elementary Professional Development	70	0-100
		ExCET Secondary Professional Development	70	0-100
	Academic Content	ExCET Elementary Comprehensive	70	0-100
		ExCET English	70	0-100
		ExCET Mathematics	70	0-100

*See Appendix D footnote #1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").